Mobile Driver License RFP 17081

Questions Set 3:

Q1. Will COTS solutions be considered for this opportunity to fast track Iowa's MDL vision? For example, if the requirements are met by a COTS solution, how should vendors respond to the RFP?

R1. Yes, a COTS solution will be considered for this opportunity. Vendor's response should demonstrate how their solution meets the use cases and requirements described in the RFP.

Q2. With respect to Core Use Case 8, will the business processes (i.e. lost license, replacement, duplicate, etc.) for managing an mDL differ from this on place for existing plastic DL?

R2. The eligibility requirements for an mDL versus a physical DL, whether new, renewed, or a replacement or other duplicate, will not be different. The mDL is expected to serve as a vehicle to authenticate the user and complete a transaction without requiring a personal visit to a driver's license office, and in that sense the business processes between the two could differ.

Q3. What is the expected population size of Users, Authenticators & Stakeholders on boarded annually and forecasted growth projections for the next five years?

R3. The expected population of users may be defined at the largest margin by the number of credential holders in Iowa, which is approximately 2.2 million people. Estimates indicate just under 70 percent of persons in the U.S, own smartphones, so potential users may exceed 1.5M and may increase as

smartphone ownership increases. Actual adoption rates within this user group and by authenticators and stakeholders will depend on success of the solution; any attempt to predict adoption rates would be speculative at this point.

Q4. What types of retail/commercial entities do you plan on onboarding initially as stakeholders?

R4. Likely retail and commercial targets include alcohol and tobacco retailers; banks, credit unions and other financial institutions; and pharmacies.

Q5. Beyond section 508 accessibility are there any applicable State standards? Please confirm the accessibility requirements are within the limits of the device platform i.e. capabilities for users of a mobile phone.

R5. State standards can be found here - https://ocio.iowa.gov/standards. If device platforms cannot support a specific 508 requirement, these gaps should be documented by the vendor.

Q6. Given the likely differences and particularities of each North American state's requirements, use cases, T&Cs and volumes, prices and provisions will have to be adjusted on a case by case basis. Would the state consider removing this requirement from the standard contract terms?

R6. No**.**

Q7. Appendix A has multiple requirements that are not fully articulated. Could the State add another round of questions and answers after the requirements have been published?

R7. Appendix A is a traceability matrix to track ability to meet use case requirements detailed more fully in the main body of the RFP. These are intended to summarize requirements to be tracked and are not intended to be

detailed articulations of requirements. The State does not believe another round of questions is warranted.

Q8. Would the State accept years of experience provided to Federal government agencies as well as state and local agencies to meet the PM experience requirement?

R8. Yes.

Q9. In "Price Proposal 2", vendor assumes that the note in the last column of section A Cost Breakdown by Role/Function and Section B Cost Breakdown by Implementation Service Category should read "Above line must equal Total Implementation Costs". Please confirm.

R9. No. The Total Lump Sum Cost is the total of all roles for the Group – Implementation and Application Support Statement of work.

Q10. Are the 7 Minimum Qualifications listed in Appendix B disqualifiers for any bidders who do not meet those minimums?

R10. The seven minimum qualifications are organized by statement of work. Not every qualification applies to every statement of work, as demonstrated within the table presented in Appendix B. Inability to meet a minimum qualification is subject to rejection.

Q11. Can annual licensing costs of our existing software be included in the price proposal for Implementation and Application Support? The current form only allows for hours worked and services provided.

R11. Potential licensing costs should be included in the Service Category and in the Cost Breakdown for Application Support by Year. See also Section 6.9

Q12. Will the Iowa DOT want ownership of all intellectual property of the technology that is built in accordance with this RFP, or can we license some of the technology to it? In other words, is this RFP intended to be 100% work for hire?

R12. The RFP is not intended to be 100% work for hire. Per Section 6.9 the Contractor shall include the cost for all software licenses and annual software maintenance fees required for its work.

Q13. Appendix B – Minimum Qualifications by Item While some of the qualifications outlined can be met by more than one company, taken collectively, only one company can qualify to bid. For Iowa DOT to conduct a full evaluation of solutions offered by multiple bidders, we recommend the following qualifications replace those that are in the solicitation:
- Responder has at least five (5) years of application design experience for iOS and Android platforms
- Responder has developed a mobile application similar to the proposed Iowa mDL solution and will
make it only available to government agencies
- Responder has been developing and implementing citizen facing solutions within the last fifteen (15)
years for Federal, state or local government agencies with a population of at least 3 million people
- Responder's lead program manager has a minimum of ten (10) years' experience leading full
lifecycle implementations for federal, state or local government agencies

R13. The minimum qualifications shall remain as issued.

Q14. If Iowa recognizes the benefits of opening up the solicitation to multiple bidders as detailed above, we request that the response due date (and all subsequent dates in the timeline) be extended 30 calendar days from the date of issuance of responses to questions.

R14. The response due date has been extended to October 19, 2016.

Q15. Clause 3.5.2.2: "Contextual Use Case 2 – authenticate an mDL Manually".
Is it correct to assume, that the mDL does not leave the DL holders hands?

R15. This should not be assumed; Vendor should explain what interaction
vendor's solution will require between the holder, user and device to accomplish
manual authentication.

Q16. Clause 3.5.2.2: "Contextual Use Case 2 – authenticate an mDL Manually".
"Using visual inspection and traditional means of verification". The device
represent information digitally and is not a physical card. Can you please
elaborate how to do visual inspection and traditional verification on a digital
device without a digital verification device?

R16. Vendor should explain how vendor's solution will facilitate visual verification
in a digital context.

Q17. Clause 3.5.2.2: "Contextual Use Case 2 – authenticate an mDL Manually".
"Using visual inspection and traditional means of verification". The overall
security of ID/DL and other credentialing system is defined by the weakest
security link. Visual inspection of a digital image is such a case. Especially if it is
defined as a use-case for persons not owing a verification device. There is
multitude of attacks and misuse allowing such cases to be possible. Even if such
method include that the mDL shall show security features when the mDL is
online. Such scenarios are the most probable one to be misused. Script Kiddies
can emulate online connection as well as what supposed to be a "security
features" shown on a digital screen. Interesting reading can be found here:
http://blog.ibmjstart.net/2016/05/06/rotating-picture-is-not-the-magic-wand-to-
prevent-fake-ids/ . To raise acceptance for sake of security should not be
acceptable. We strongly suggest to drop this use case.

R17. There is no question here. If the question is "Will you drop this use case", then the answer is "No". While the DOT agrees that visual inspection of a digital image does not represent strong authentication, it is common in transactions requiring a low level of trust.

Q18. Does the vendor have to calculate the operational cost for the online-service fee charged by telecom operators for the in-state online-verification and also for the out-of-state online-verification?

R18. Responders should calculate all costs as requested in the RFP.

Q19. Would the Iowa DOT be able to disclose the approximate cost of the pilot program?

R19. The cost was less than $50,000. The pilot program was limited in scope, duration, and required limited support and should not be compared to a fully deployed implementation.

Q20. Would the Iowa DOT be able to disclose the budget for the mDL program?

R20. Funding for the project will not be disclosed.

Q21. Is the vendor responsible for providing a detailed response to each of the use cases contained within Appendix A?

R21. Yes, the vendor should provide sufficient detail to explain how the vendor's solution will meet and solve each use case.

Q22. Is it mandatory for the testing vendor to provide a lump-sum approximation of pricing? Testing efforts are impacted by the specific technology choices of other vendors and can be hard to predict without existing assumptions.

R22. Yes.

Q23. In order to extract production data, we may need access to the State of Iowa's production systems. What is the requirement for individuals to access this information (background checks, DOT email address, etc)?

R23. Confidentiality and non-disclosure agreements are required by vendor's staff working on the project. Persons accessing production data that may be used to publish or present an mDL will be subject to a background check that meets the requirements of 6 C.F.R. section 37.45. Additional requirements will be determined during contract negotiations.

Q24. Will test plans include pilot/roll-out/field testing? Will testing involve interoperability and functional testing of mDL at other endpoints (ie: use of ID at airports, grocery stores, etc)?

R24. Test plans may include roll-out/field testing as agreed to between the DOT and vendor, and should involve all functions, including authentication and verification by end users, to prove ability to function as intended across the use cases described.

Q25. Is the Iowa DMV only looking for US specific client references? Can vendors submit Non-Government Clients references?

R25. All credible references will be considered.